


Christian Order



Summary of Contents for October, 1984

THE POPE : SUCCESSOR OF ST. PETER	<i>Mgr. Mario Oliveri</i>
CATECHETICS : A TEACHER'S EXPERIENCE	<i>Margaret Fitzgerald</i>
ROOTS OF RATIONALISM AND MOTHER TERESA	<i>Malcolm Muggeridge and Michael Davies</i>
PRO-LIFE PROBLEMS	<i>Phyllis Bowman</i>
SECULARIZATION AND THE PROTECTED CHURCH : 4	<i>The Editor</i>
SOCIALISM AND THE GOSPEL	<i>Zimbabwe Bishops</i>

ON FREEDOM AND DIGNITY

There are today hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of witnesses to the faith, all too often ignored or forgotten by public opinion . . . They are often known to God alone. They suffer daily hardships in various parts of every continent. . . .

[But the difficulties of living the faith] are not due only to external restrictions on freedom, or to constraints by men, laws, or regimes. They can also come from customs and ways of thinking that are contrary to evangelical principles and that have a powerful influence on society.

Again, it could be the influence of materialism and of religious indifference that kills spiritual aspirations; or the false and individualistic notion of freedom that confuses the possibility of choosing whatever gratifies one's passions with the concern for fully developing one's human calling, spiritual destiny, and the common good.

It is not this kind of freedom that forms the basis of human dignity and encourages Christian faith. Believers who are surrounded by such influences need great courage to remain sane and faithful, and to exercise their freedom properly.

Pope John Paul II

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

450 IN THIS OUR HOPE *The Editor*

452 PRO-LIFE PROBLEMS
Phyllis Bowman

458 THE POPE: SUCCESSOR
OF ST. PETER
Mgr. Mario Oliveri

477 CATECHETICS: A TEACHER'S
EXPERIENCE *Margaret Fitzgerald*

482 SECULARIZATION AND THE
PROTECTED CHURCH: 4
The Editor

492 FATHER ROBERT PARSONS, S.J.
Monica King

499 CONVERSATION PIECE: 2
ROOTS OF RATIONALISM &
MOTHER TERESA
*Malcolm Muggeridge and
Michael Davies*

506 SOCIALISM AND THE
GOSPEL *Zimbabwe Bishops*

511 BOOK REVIEW *Paul Crane, S.J.*

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £3 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$5.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£6, U.S. \$15
Australia—£7, A. \$15
N. Zealand—£7, N.Z. \$15

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 25

OCTOBER

NO. 10

In This Our Hope

THE EDITOR

I CANNOT see that anything is to be gained by pretending that things in the Church today are other than they are. They are in a bad way. Nothing is to be gained by pretending they are not. Still less by branding as "pessimistic", "prophets of doom" and the like those who see them as such.

The times in which we live call neither for optimism nor pessimism from those within the Catholic Church. What they do call for is hope, which is alien to both these terms. Each one of them is shallow in itself; underlying both are implications of presumption, which is always uncalled for, particularly in the present situation. Unaided human effort will do nothing to right the present very grave state of affairs within the Church. What it calls for is the exercise of the supremely Christian virtue of hope, by which we are given the strength to hold firmly and with quiet fortitude to the promises made by Christ Our Lord to His Church and to place the whole of our trust most firmly in Him, Who is the Way, the Truth and the Life. To see things as they are; to face them firmly and stand up to them courageously with the whole of our trust in Him; in this is our peace.

By which I do not mean quiescence. Too many Catholics think that it does. Reference here is in no way only

to the laity. Clergy and religious of every rank are included in the number of those whose reaction to the present crisis within the Church is to withdraw from it; to find for themselves what might be described as a mental quiet corner in which they take refuge. This way, they hope the crisis will pass them by. In no way will they let themselves get involved in the present conflict. They have their own lives to lead. It is not for them.

These have no understanding, I fear, of what peace is. They think of it in purely negative terms as passivity; a withdrawal from. Peace is nothing of the sort. It is immensely positive, the fruit of a great, persistent and persevering activity. Peace is what Saint Augustine described so beautifully and with such accuracy as "*transquillitas ordinata*"; which I can only translate somewhat clumsily as the calm steadiness in well-doing which comes to those whose lives are set by the Truth given by Christ to His Church. These do not flinch from the defence of that Truth when it is under attack, as it is so cruelly within the Church at the present time. They do not duck conflict. They are prepared to engage in it in the best way open to them, when Catholic Truth is at stake. To uphold it, they give what they have; very often at great cost to themselves.

It is these who are at peace in the Church today. Their's is the tranquillity of heart of which Augustine speaks and which comes to those who love God's truth and give their daily all for it. His peace is always with them. It is they who are holding up the Church today. Under God, it is they — precisely because the whole of their striving is under God — who will gain the victory that will most certainly be her's.

In this is our hope.

KINDLY NOTE

that rising costs of production and postage make it a matter of urgent necessity that in their kindness, readers of *Christian Order* should do their best to reply to reminders that subscriptions are due without any delay.

In this Address given, like others we have published, at a meeting at Preston held under the auspices of "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice", Mrs. Phyllis Bowman, an indefatigable and most courageous pro-lifer, brings home to Catholics the truths in the pro-life field that matter and should mean so much to us.

Pro-Life Problems

PHYLLIS BOWMAN

WHEN I first became involved in the fight against abortion in 1967, the last thing I dreamed of doing was to become a practising Christian, let alone a pro-*Humanae Vitae* Catholic. But, about four years later, I became the black sheep in my organisation and was received into the Church.

We Have Lost Sight of Eternal Truths

Since that time one thing that came to me most forcibly was the manner in which Christians and, particularly, Catholics had been conned into the idea that, somehow, by breaking God's law, we would create a better and more peaceful society; that we would become happier people; more fulfilled as individuals. I became increasingly convinced that, if we believe that, we are calling the God of love an illogical idiot with no feeling for the people He has created.

I began to examine more and more closely what was happening around us and came to the conclusion — confirmed in my attendance at the National Pastoral Congress — that we have lost sight of eternal truths. I am appalled by what is happening in the Church.

At a Mass I attended at the Congress a priest, indirectly addressing me, said we were all liable to become cranks if we believed that "truth was crystallised at any one point in time". After Mass I asked him whether he was suggesting that one week it could be the Pope proclaiming the truth and the next week the Ayatollah because, if

truth is subject to change, that was the kind of situation facing us.

They think they are so modern but, in actual fact, having swept aside any concept of eternal, changeless truth; any concept of a great design, they are leading us as slaves to fashion; and the one sure thing about fashion is that it changes remarkably quickly. Today we are being led by people who believe they are fashionable when, in reality, they are really old-fashioned.

Last year the Holy Father issued a very remarkable document — *Familiaris Consortio* which covers the role and the needs of the family in today's Society. He refers constantly to the documents of Vatican II and to *Humanae Vitae*, stressing the vital role of Catholic schools and giving special attention to the part played by parents and the educating community. If you are going to form a perfect educating community in terms of eternal truth, you cannot water down the truth.

Parent Withdrawal

In her masterly book on delinquent fantasies, Patricia Morgan claims that the overwhelming problem with contemporary youngsters is parent withdrawal. She writes "Parents are morally nervous, uncertain, mixed-up and confused themselves. They have rejected their own moral education and they simply withdraw from instructing the child". To a great extent this is not the fault of the parents or priests. It is the fault of those who do nothing to clarify the situation or to explain the results of breaking God's law.

Parents and young people are confused too by teaching which becomes dated from year to year. We have scientists from all over the world stating that Darwin's theories are simply a series of suppositions unsupported by fact. Professor Jerome Lejeune says that the neo-Darwinist is now reaching the dignity in the history of science that the Ptolemaic system has reached in Astronomy. We know that it does not work. In the same way the Women's Liberation Movement and an increasing number of other people are beginning to realise that artificial methods of contraception are unacceptable. But those who have lent themselves to the acceptability of those methods—although

they do not openly say so — have placed themselves in a position of looking very foolish indeed.

Familiaris Consortio states that every effort must be made to make the moral norms which must guide the responsible transmission of life known to all married couples and to young adults before marriage through clear, timely and serious instruction and education. Knowledge must lead to education in self-control. Hence the need for the virtue of chastity. It goes on to say that, as the teacher (the Church) “She never tires of proclaiming the moral norm that must guide the responsible transmission of life”. When I think of the Church in this country I am reminded of the Horlicks advertisement: “Doctor, I even wake up feeling tired”. I have yet to hear any statement here.

Some Problems Confronting Today's Families

The problems facing Society today are very grave. One in three marriages ends in divorce. Divorce and legalised abortion were supposed to liberate woman and raise their dignity, and to overcome child tragedies. We were told that this liberalisation would bring to an end the tragedy of children in care, child-battering and so on. This is another example of believing that breaking God's law will create a better society. In those countries where divorce has been made easy and abortion legalised, there has been a dramatic increase in child tragedy. Killing the baby in the womb does not inspire greater respect for the child. We were ridiculed when we said that abortion would lead to euthanasia. We have all read in the last few years of the fate of new-born handicapped babies.

Two years ago the Government Short Report was published. It recommended that the law should be changed to allow new-born handicapped babies to be used as guinea pigs for the benefit of Society. We wrote to our Hierarchy. Only one organisation — the Anti-Vivisection Society gave us public support. None of our great humane societies said a word.

Mrs. Bowman went on to describe how her passionate concern for the unborn child had led her to change her way of life and to the recognition that the contraceptive mentality inevitably led to the abortion mentality. For the

first time, she had realised that Christian morality teaches that no man can possibly be an island because whatever one person does in his or her life affects those around us.

"I was" she said "absolutely astounded by the beauty of *Humanae Vitae* which I had been led to believe was a terrible document. Professor Paul Ramsey, a Protestant Moral Theologian at Princeton recognised that, once you introduce contraception, you incipiently make the sexual act an end in itself. You also recognise the possibility of other means of procreation. The two are divorced, thereby opening the way to practices we are witnessing today. The Professor, in his argument, writes of *in vitro* fertilization: 'Ostensibly, the end in view is therapeutic, the altogether praiseworthy objective of enabling a woman to have a child of her own but, when objection is raised that this should not be done by means which cannot be guaranteed not to be injurious to the child, the only possible answer is—and logically must be—that those who justify this procedure mean, in all sorts of other ways, to control and predetermine the product'".

We have seen this in the conditions laid down by those practising *in vitro* fertilization in this country. They only agree to carry out the procedure on condition that the woman agrees to an abortion if the baby is handicapped or abnormal. They are, in fact, "pre-determining" the product. This is nothing new. The early Family Planners were quite openly members of the Eugenic Society which advocated the use of contraception so that the "best" people could breed.

Contraception and Third-World Decimation

There is increasing evidence, recognised by Rome, that contraception is persistently promoted—not to help Third World countries; but to decimate their populations. The myth of the population explosion is used to promote this practice. Unless action is taken, we are told, we shall all be standing in 5 square feet per person (figures put forward by the United Nations). The fifty million square miles of land surface, excluding Antarctica could accommodate 290 trillion persons which is 78,378 times the earth's present inhabitants. The U.N. figures have been

challenged many times by demographers, a considerable number of whom estimate that the present population is about one third of that claimed.

It is significant that neither Aldous Huxley nor C. S. Lewis saw the abuse of political power or nuclear destruction as the greatest threat to humanity, as lesser men have done. Instead Lewis's analysis and Huxley's bitter satire singled out genetics, pharmacology and experimental embryology as sources of future great evil. At the time of the Anglican debate on contraception in 1926, C. S. Lewis wrote "once they accepted contraception, they would accept abortion and, ultimately, euthanasia". The Anglican statement after the death of baby John Pearson would indicate that many of them do accept euthanasia.

In 1951 Pope Pius XII condemned artificial insemination which he referred to as a defensible step only in terms of one set of immediate values. But, in the longer view along the road to the transformation of human procreation into manufacture in biological laboratories, it was indefensible: "To reduce the co-habitation of married persons and the conjugal act to a mere organic function would be to convert the domestic hearth, sanctuary of the family into nothing more than a biological laboratory".

We can see today the same master-race mentality which infected the family planning organisations years ago. I would like to quote from an article in the *Evening Standard* of 11th May, 1977: "For what must be this year's prize-winning entry for reckless conduct in public places, a senior State Department Officer (U.S.) has said that the U.S. is seeking to provide the means to sterilise a quarter of Third World women—in part to protect the business of America overseas and, they quoted: In 1952 David Rockefeller compiled a report for President Eisenhower which concluded that 'a rise in the birthrate of the poorer nations would create instability and endanger U.S. access to important resources'".

In the same year the Population Council was erected with Rockefeller financial support. There is a complex web of intercommunication between the birth control zealots, bankers who finance the Population Council and the State Department Agency for International Develop-

ment which distributes 143 million dollars a year to American population programmes. At the centre of the storm now raging over U.S. population policy is Washington University, Louisiana where over seventy foreign doctors are trained in advanced fertility management under a two million dollar grant. Each doctor is presented with a 5,000 dollar laparoscope which is used in performing sterilisations.

Contraception and Abortion Not Purely Catholic Doctrine

We also need to look at the situation in this country where the Church has allowed the position to develop where contraception and abortion are regarded as purely Catholic issues. Yet the older Churches, Russian Orthodox, Greek, Coptics, Armenian all hold the same teaching. Jews, Buddhists, Mohammedans, Hindus all reject artificial birth control. Yet, two years ago, the *Short Report*, which I mentioned earlier, recommended that, in order to qualify for inclusion on the obstetrics lists, ordinary general practitioners must have experience in family planning and sterilisation. This is the worst kind of discrimination. Not only does it deprive doctors of the opportunity to practise obstetrics; it deprives ethnic minorities, who surely have problems enough, of the opportunity of consulting doctors who share their beliefs and forces them into the hands of doctors who accept practices which are contrary to those beliefs.

We have brought this to public attention. The most vociferous critic has been the Women's Liberation Movement when they discovered that Asian women were being injected with contraceptive drugs without their knowledge. Women have been sterilised without realising it. But the Church has been silent. Apparently the stand against racialism can only be adopted if it follows the popular line! It is hypocritical to claim to defend the immigrant population while ignoring the denial of their most basic right—to live by their belief and moral ethics. Truth is a whole. It is not like an orange. You cannot just take one segment. You have to stand and fight for the whole of it. This is what we have to preach.

The text of this article reproduces an Address given by Mgr. Mario Oliveri, when he was first Secretary to the Apostolic Pro-Nuncio to Great Britain at a conference for priests in London. Acknowledgements and thanks to the Author and Joint Publishers — the Apostolate of Catholic Truth and Pro Fide — for permission to publish in *Christian Order*.

The Pope : Successor of St. Peter

MGR. MARIO OLIVERI

IN this talk of mine, which has as its precise theme "The Universal Mission of the Successor of Peter", I would like to try to give you, if possible, not so much a scholastic or academic exposition of the functions which the Bishop of Rome fulfils or ought to fulfil in the life of the whole Church but rather a consideration of how the supreme pastoral office of the Bishop of Rome is incorporated into the Mystery of Christ, into the Mystery of Incarnation and is therefore an essential sacred and sacramental ministry of sanctification and redemption.

Yes, I repeat it, the unique apostolic office of the Pope, the Successor of Peter, is—by its very nature—fully incorporated into the saving work of the Church because it is fully incorporated into the redemptive, salvific activity of Christ.

So we put ourselves on a theological level, on the level of Faith. In a discussion like this we cannot, then, use criteria of reasoning or knowledge which are only on the level of human intelligence. Our intelligence must be enlightened and strengthened by divine Revelation and by divine Grace.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

(a) Let us come, first of all, to two preliminary considerations. One cannot properly speak about role, func-

tions or mission without at the same time referring to the nature of the bearer—as bearer—of that role, function or mission. One cannot understand what the Pope—as Pope—is doing or ought to do without first being aware of who he is and what he is.

This holds true for any other matter or any other subject of discussion. There have been and are, some philosophical and theological Movements which maintain, at least implicitly, the primacy of action over being, of doing over being, of becoming over being; everything is, accordingly, in a state of confusion.

In order to understand the Mysteries of God (in so far as God Himself has made them intelligible to us); in order to comprehend the Mystery of Christ, that of His Incarnation, and to discern the nature of man and the human persona, one must always keep inviolate the absolute primacy of being. The act, its quality and value depend on being, on the character and nature of being. Let's take an example: Priestly activity in the Church depends on the priestly nature of the person who carries out such actions. Sacred Ordination is not primarily a matter of giving a certain task to a person to carry out certain actions; it is, rather, the giving to him of a new interior ontological capacity which can come only from a new being or mode of being that he acquires.

b) The Successor of Peter is at the centre, at the very heart of the Mystery of the Church, of that which the Church is and does. And so it is almost always the case that what is referred to the Church can be referred to the Pope and vice versa. And although conceptually one can speak of the mission of the Pope in the Church and of his Mission outside it (not everyone and not everything is the Church, and this state of affairs will continue to the end of time), nevertheless, the two missions are intimately connected and on occasions merge, as for example: that which the Church is and does for itself may be said to be indissolubly linked with that which she is and does for those who still do not form part of the Church.

Let me give an example to clarify this concept. When later on I say that the Successor of Peter is the supreme visible Guarantor of Revelation, it will be obvious that

such a function applies both to those who are already in the Church and to those who are not yet, or will never be, part of it. Or to put it another way, he is the Guarantor of Revelation both within the Church and for the world.

These two preliminary considerations provide the general orientation within which we shall be working.

“UBI PETRUS, IBI ECCLESIA”

In order to understand who the Pope is and the nature of his mission, both for the Church and the world, it is opportune to keep in mind the following essential ideas:

a) The Church is the continuation in time, of the Mystery of the Incarnation; it is the realisation in history, that is to say in space and time, of the Redemption accomplished by Christ.

b) Peter is, in the person of his Successors, the perpetual and visible foundation and principle of the Church (Mt. 16.18). The idea of a foundation, a rock, does not merely indicate the solidity of the construction, but indicates that part without which the building itself cannot properly exist and subsist. Peter and his Successors belong to the constitutive reality of the Church. The Church cannot fully exist without its visible foundation.

It follows from this that the whole reality of the Church is in some way concentrated in Peter. This is not merely my personal opinion or that of theologians; the idea that Peter personifies the Church, represents the entire Church, bears within himself the whole reality of the Church, derives from the Fathers of the Church. It is enough to remember at this point—and I shall mention it again—the famous saying of St. Ambrose. “*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*”.

However, this does not mean that we are denying that others also are the Church! But these are not and cannot be such, at least fully, if not grounded on the foundation established by Christ, if not upon that reality which Christ willed, established and constituted, in order to continue in space and time the Mystery of the divine reality of his Incarnation and of his redemptive, salvific work.

One can, therefore, say that in the secure line of Tradition no visible foundation and principle exists for the

Church which is not Peter or which is not in living relation and communion with him. The other Apostles also received from Christ a nature and mission which are identical in many respects — but not all — with that of Peter.

This is so because with him as the head, they form a unique body, a unique sacramental reality, a unique constitutive reality of the Church of Christ. Not all in the Church have the same mission and function as Peter, but no mission in the Church exists which is not bound to that of Peter. "*Nihil sine Petro; omnia cum Petro*".

I want to quote you a recent statement made by John Paul II to certain Bishops, during their *ad limina* visit to himself :

"With Him (the Successor of Peter) the Bishops wish to confirm in this way, too, a communion of mind, of heart and discipline. They are aware that the mandate of jurisdiction, which is given to them, comes to them subordinate to their hierarchic communion with Peter, by whose choice or approval their canonical mission is actually determined.

"This act of Faith on the part of the Bishops is rooted in the very nucleus of the Catholic Faith, and so sound and faithful tradition affirms with the Fathers of the Church: "*Nihil sine Petro*".

SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

There are those, obviously, who find in such statements and concepts, a triumphalistic tone, a rhetorical exaggeration, an influence of the "ultramontane"—as they like to call it—doctrine; there are even those who see here something that detracts from the absolute centrality of Christ. But this is not the case, because the great emphasis on the Mystery of the Church and upon the unique constitutive apostolic ministry of Peter and his Successors, is none other than the recognition of the divine plan of salvation, as is attested by Holy Scripture and Tradition: it is the acceptance of the reality of the Mystery of the Incarnation, which is not and cannot be perceived by us if not through the visible reality of the Church and in particular by means of continuity of the visible apostolic ministry of Peter, which is realised in the uninterrupted succession of those who occupy the place of Peter in the Church.

It is clear that everything that the Church is, everything that the Church as such has or does, everything that Peter is for the Church, and everything that he possesses or does for the Church, derives from Christ, derives from the Mystery of God Incarnate and leads to Him, so that in Him we may have already now, but in a manner which will only be perfect in eternity, a Communion with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

It is obvious—and the Church of Rome has always taught it, even if it appears that some ignore or object to it—that the function of Peter and his Successors like that of the other Apostles, and their Successors, the Bishops, like, too, that of all ministers in the Church, is not a substitute for the Person and the Mission of Christ, but it is a representative function, instrumental-ministerial. Neither they, nor the community of believers or baptised are at the source of the sacred function of the Church's ministers. Christ is the One who works through *his* ministers, whether they are the successors of Peter, the successors of the Apostles, or anyone else endowed with or appointed, through sacramental ordination, to a sacred ministerial function by Christ.

I repeat: it is not the Church, nor the community which creates or produces the ministries. Only Christ, the Son of God Incarnate, can create sacred ministries, in His continuing Sovereignty over all the Church and over all creation. It is Christ, who, through His ministers, builds, maintains and develops His Church. It is Christ who acts in the Sacred Liturgy, through the instrumental and ministerial work of those who in Sacred Ordination and in the context of true, legitimate Apostolic Succession, acquire a new ontological conformity with Christ, the Priest and Mediator, and who become, then capable of acting "*in persona Christi*". This is the Faith of the Catholic Church.

If the mission of the ministers of the Church is deprived of its sacramental origin, which is therefore also divine and immediately Christological, it is reduced to a pure function on the human level, the social level. It is robbed of its true and unique *raison d'être*, which is essentially of a supernatural order.

If these truths are lost from sight, then we see the emergence of the crisis of identity among the ministers of the Church; they go to look for substitute-functions, becoming trades-unionists, social workers, workers on a philanthropic level, the "clashing cymbals" of which St. Paul speaks.

Then emerges a crisis of a moral and disciplinary order, and the mission of the Church loses its proper and real efficacy, which is essentially — once again — of a supernatural order, and which is located on the level of Revelation and Grace; in fact on the level of the life of the Holy Trinity, in which man participates through the sacred ministries and the sacred realities of Revelation.

It is worth repeating that all this can only be said in the light of Faith, in a vision of Faith. The Church's true reality, and thus necessarily also the nature of its foundation, of all its sacred ministries, cannot be discovered nor evaluated according to human and sociological criteria nor by adopting those concepts which are valid only for earthly realities and secular society. It can only be comprehended and properly evaluated with the help of the criteria of Faith, that is to say, with criteria which accept the reality of Revelation, the Mystery of the Incarnation of God which surpasses all possibility of our knowing it either intellectually or scientifically. To do otherwise would be to alter the reality of the Mystery.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

But let us proceed with our discussion. Man cannot attain salvation or the end for which he is created if not in Christ, if he does not become a participant in the Mystery of the Incarnation.

There can be no salvation for man if not in God whom we know from Revelation to be Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But God cannot be reached if not in Christ in whom the invisible nature of God is united with the human, and this human nature has become the universal Sacrament of Salvation. Christ is the Revelation of God — He is the Salvation which comes from God and the Love of God made visible.

But Christ cannot be reached if He is not found in His Church, and in the witness of His Apostles—if not in the sacred realities which He has established and which in some way realise and replace in Space and time His visible presence. The Humanity of the Son of God which is the universal Sacrament of Salvation, is no longer to be seen but it is, nevertheless, present and at work in the Church, in its sacred realities, in its Sacraments and its ministries.

But it is precisely here that the great question arises: where can I find, with complete certainty and in its fulness the Church of Christ, so that in it Christ Himself may be discovered—His Revelation, His Sacraments, His teaching, His grace, and His divine life?

Where, in their fulness, can I find all the elements which make up Christ's Church? Before mentioning these essential constitutive elements of the Church, it is necessary to remember that it would not be possible to recognise in the Church of today the Church of Christ if it were not possible to encounter in it the substantial identity of the Apostolic Church, if there did not exist a fundamental continuity in time between the Church founded by Christ on Peter ("You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church") and the Church of today, a continuity between the essential elements of the Church realised and founded by the Apostles and the Church of today.

There cannot be, then, identity without continuity, and there can be no continuity without *Traditio*; without real, true and legitimate Apostolic Succession.

It is clear that the elements which constitute the Church are (1) its FAITH, based on the preaching of the Apostles—the one authentic guarantee of Revelation, (2) the supernatural means of salvation (SACRAMENTS) established by Christ and promulgated by the Apostles, (3) the SACRED and SACRAMENTAL MINISTRIES through which Christ Himself brings about the salvation of men, offering them His Grace, His Life and the possibility of becoming partakers of His eternal destiny.

We have, then Faith, Sacraments and Sacred Ministries for the realisation of a life of communion with God, which becomes definitive only in eternity (not in time).

PRIMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME

But at this point comes the question which we raised before; what guarantee do I have that the Faith, Sacraments and ministries of the Church today—which I should be able to find in each local Church—are in continuity with those of the Apostolic Church? How can I be certain that the Pastor of the Local Church, the Bishop, who personifies and represents the Local Church, can truly call himself Successor of the Apostles.

This guarantee can only come from the concordance of the Local Church with the model of the Church in which the Faith of the Apostles and everything which belongs to the essential nature of the Church of Christ cannot fail. This Church can only be that constituted by Christ as the visible and definitive point of reference, since it was founded by the Apostle Peter, who received the promise of the Lord, "I have prayed for you, that your Faith may not fail", and the mission that followed that: "Confirm your brothers". Only Peter received such a unique promise and such a unique mission. Only the Church of Rome constitutes such a visible, definitive model, because it is founded on the preaching of Peter and on his supreme testimony of Faith and Love for his Divine Master and the Divine Shepherd of the whole flock.

In the Church, in each local Church, which wishes to remain the One and Unique Church of Christ, there can be no authentic and true Faith, then, which is not the Faith of Peter and the Apostles, the uniquely authentic witnesses of Revelation, pre-ordained by God; there can be no true means of salvation (Sacraments) which are not those instituted by the Son of God Incarnate and entrusted to the Apostles; there can be no other sacred-supernatural, hierarchical ministries, except those established by God for the eternal salvation of man.

The fact that the Bishop of the Church of Rome is the Successor of St. Peter gives him a particular place in the sphere of the communion of the Churches, but it also gives him a function, exclusively his, with reference to the universality and totality of the one and unique Church of Christ. "The office entrusted by the Lord solely remains". (L.G.2). The particular prerogatives of Peter continue,

residing in the Bishop of the Church of Peter founded upon his supreme testimony of Faith, so that it is the witness of the indefectible Faith of the Apostle to whom Christ said: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail, and that you in your turn, may confirm your brethren".

(a) It follows, then, that the guaranteeing of the Faith of the Church is undoubtedly the primary function and role inherent in the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and which makes it therefore pre-eminently a Primacy of Faith. The teaching of the Faith, carried on by the Bishops, finds its ultimate point of reference and assurance in the teaching of the Bishop of Rome. He is the Guarantor of the Faith of his brethren and of the whole Church, and safeguards the communion of Faith.

(b) The unity of the Church does not consist only in unity of Faith but includes oneness of Sacraments and of Discipline as well—that is to say of its basic structure and organisation. The Successor of Peter is the visible principle and foundation of the Church's unity, particularly of the "Body of Bishops", since Peter has been established rock and foundation of the Church of Christ (Mt.16, 18). He safeguards the *Communio Sacramentorum et Disciplinae*, not only that of Faith.

(c) Indissolubly connected with the prerogative just mentioned is that of being uniquely entrusted with the power "to bind and to loose". Peter was proclaimed by Christ as the keeper of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mt.16.19), or the administrator of the Sacred realities which lead to Salvation.

(d) Finally, the Bishop of Rome is the Shepherd of the whole flock of Christ, because everyone was entrusted to the pastoral care of Peter (Jn.21, 15-19).

Before considering some of the consequences of these prerogatives, proper to the Bishop of Rome, which form the "Primacy", it is worth reminding ourselves of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council in this matter.

The doctrine of the institution, perpetuity, importance and nature of the "Sacred Primacy" of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible magisterium are reasserted as articles of Faith for all believers. This reiterates the teaching of

the First Vatican Council. Turning then to the doctrine concerning Bishops, consistent emphasis is laid upon the special nature of the office proper to the Bishop of Rome and his unique position with regard to the universal Church and the episcopal College. It is stated that the Lord gave to Simon alone the function of being the rock and "the keeper of the keys" in the Church, and established him as Shepherd of all his flock. The Roman Pontiff as Peter's Successor is called the "Vicar of Christ" and the Shepherd of the entire Church; he is the Supreme Pastor of the Church, to whom the care of the whole flock is entrusted. Moreover, he is the perpetual and visible principle and foundation of the unity both of the Bishops and the universal faithful. He is supreme Shepherd and Teacher of all the faithful and confirms his Brethren in the Faith. He is singularly endowed with the charism of the infallibility of the Church itself and by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ and Pastor of the whole Church he has fullness of authority over her; authority which is supreme and universal and which he is always entitled to exercise freely.

THE COLLEGE OF BISHOPS

The Roman Pontiff is the Head of the College of Bishops and precisely as such he alone can perform certain acts which are completely outside the competence of all the other Bishops. In this sphere of the episcopal College he has a special position, entirely and exclusively his own.

Actually it is impossible to speak about an episcopal College at all if one does not include the Bishop of Rome as its Head. The College cannot exist without its head—it has no authority if it is not conceived of together with the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of Peter as its head, with his power of Primacy remaining whole and intact—primacy extending both to Pastors and Faithful alike. Moreover the exercise of the jurisdictional authority of the College depends entirely on the will of the Pope, both when it is exercised solemnly in an Oecumenical Council and when it is exercised by the Bishops dispersed throughout the world.

The preliminary explanatory Note to *Lumen Gentium* states that the College of Bishops, while always existing, does not, however, always act in a strictly collegial manner, nor can it function if not at intervals and with the approval of its Head. Therefore it is the Pope who sets the conditions for the being and activity of the Episcopal College.

Collegiality would not seem to give rise to grave difficulties with regard to Primacy, nor should the Primacy of Peter be seen as some sort of suppression of the Bishops' powers, if the relations between Collegiality and Primacy were defined by starting from the relation existing between the particular Churches and the universal Church, bearing in mind, of course, that the Church of Rome has a special and unique relation to the whole.

For what is Collegiality other than the *Communio* which must exist between all the Churches; it is the common possession of the same Faith (the external forms of its expression may vary, but its content must remain the same and identical in its entirety and all that comes from Divine Revelation is essential), and of the same Sacraments or supernatural means of eternal salvation, of the same Sacred Ministries, through whom Christ, Divine Lord and Head of the whole Body, communicates Divine Life and salvation to all in the Body of the Redeemed and Sanctified.

It is clear, then, that Collegiality in its true sense does not exist without the ministry of the Apostle Peter, which exists precisely so that the Church may remain One and Unique, so that all the Successors of the Apostles may form a united Body, capable of handing on Revelation with a unanimous and harmonious voice and with an undivided heart. In the same way that there can be no Church without a Bishop (its essential constitutive element) — "*sine Episcopo Ecclesia non datur*" — so there can be no Collegiality and no *Communio*, no fullness of the One and Unique Church of Christ "*sine Petro*", without effective communication with the Successor of Peter. "*Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia*".

We ought at this point to add some other considerations, keeping in mind that the communion which exists

within the Church, a mystical and juridical reality, has some aspects which function immediately on the universal level and which are not confined by the boundaries of particular or local Churches. That is why there are not many Churches of Christ, but only the one and unique Church of Christ. It is for this reason that the functions exercised by the Bishop of Rome, "*vi muneris sui*", by right of his personal prerogatives, in so far as he is the Successor of Peter, have an immediate force and efficacy with regard to the universal Church, and that in consequence it is said that his authority is universal, full and supreme as well as being immediate. Therefore he is not juridically bound to make use of others but is entitled to act personally and directly with reference to the whole Church and in his relations with each and every member of it.

The fact, then, that he is "*de iure divino*", Pastor of the whole flock, because Christ "*Pastorem totius Sui gregis constituit*", and that his primacy extends, therefore, "*in omnes sive Pastores, sive fideles*", explains why all without exception—the Bishops as well as the faithful—find themselves hierarchically subordinate to him.

THE UNIQUE NATURE OF THE POPE'S ROLE IN THE CHURCH

It is now time to offer some ideas, by way of summary, about the consequences which follow from the unique place which Peter's Successor occupies in the Church and which follow, too, from his particular prerogatives which are, by and large, his alone and which come to him through divine mandate.

Some things which I will say, are in fact no more than repetitions of what I have already said, but never mind. Choose for yourselves those expressions which mean most to you and which appear to you to have the greatest significance and relevance.

GUARANTOR OF THE CHURCH

1. In general terms, we can say that the fundamental role of Peter's Successor is that of being the ultimate visible guarantee, in space and time, of the continuity and

identity of the Church of Christ or in other words, it is that the Church of Christ should continue, unaltered in space and time, preserving its essential identity in every epoch or time of history.

Today, as always in the Church's history, there are attempts to threaten, where this is possible, the very identity of the Church. There are those who explicitly or implicitly try to alter the divine-supernatural nature of the Church, reducing it to nothing more than a human philanthropic organisation, the promoter of a development seen only in terms of this world.

There are those who would like to see a change in the organic structure of the Church, which is and must be ministerial and hierarchical (it is as we have said, unable to exist without ministries or sacred offices which derive from a sacred, sacramental and divine mandate). These ministries are, by their very nature, co-ordinated and subordinated. They depend directly upon Christ or upon those who have been entrusted by Him with sacred powers through Holy Orders and the Apostolic Succession, with particular reference to the Petrine Succession.

Such ministries are essentially and quite strictly directed towards the things of God, the Mysteries of God, the sacred, supernatural realities, the realities of Divine Revelation. Their immediate goal is never man's earthly dimension, his mundane experience, his worldly conquests.

There are those, too, who would like to reduce the mission of the Church from that which is redemptive and sanctifying (to deliver man from sin and to lead him to eternal salvation through realities which are sacred and sanctifying) to one merely directed to understanding and co-ordinating the values existing just on the human level and those of the world.

There are those who, influenced by present-day social models, put forward ideas and proposals which logically could lead nowhere else than to a community-Church which itself creates its own ministries and which determines its own structure, which organises its own celebrations and Liturgy and which interprets Revelation in a new way, constantly modifying doctrine and morals according to contemporary needs and historical circumstances.

To be vigilant, to act and teach in such a way as to detect and to correct these deviant tendencies—which see themselves as positive developments and instruments of progress, but are in fact essentially negative and harmful—is pre-eminently the mission of Peter; it is a positive task, it is to do good, it is to exercise the greatest possible charity.

We know that the nature of the Church cannot be corrupted in its profound, divine, supernatural reality because it forms part of the divine Mystery of the Incarnation of God. This supreme work of God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, cannot of course, be put in jeopardy by human actions. But what can be—and is endangered—is its true understanding and acceptance for what it really is. What is put in jeopardy is the understanding of its true nature, as Revelation, contained in the Church, has presented it. This is why the Holy Spirit assists the Successor of Peter in an ineffable and very special manner, so that through his teaching and his sacred ministry the Revelation and the Redemption by God may be today and always present in the Church and in the world.

The teaching of Peter's Successor does not, and cannot tell us anything "new", even if that which comes to us through Revelation must always be presented in a manner which enables it to be understood in its perennial truth and its timeless importance.

The teaching of the Successor of Peter and the whole Church does not and cannot say anything truly and substantially new, because the new that God has wished to reveal to us is all present in Christ, in His person and His teaching. There cannot be "another new", although it is true that what comes from revelation must continually be presented through the ages in a way that allows it to be comprehended in its perennial truth and perennial value.

GUARANTOR OF REVELATION

Christ has established Peter as the supreme, visible Guarantor of His work of salvation, and Peter lives in His successors, fulfilling his mission in teaching, preaching, safeguarding, determining, recalling, exhorting, encouraging, promoting, reproofing and governing through them. It

is obvious that the Bishop of the Church of Rome is not the only one to preach and teach, to govern and to sanctify, but no one can have the supreme guarantee that what he does in the Church is guaranteed by Christ Himself, if he is not in faithful communion with the Bishop of Rome, so that he can say that he acts in communion with the Bishop of Rome, so that he can say that he acts in communion with Peter's Successor, with one mind, one soul, one heart, and one voice.

2. The Successor of Peter assures the identity of Faith between the Church of today and the Church of the Apostles, and thus is the Guarantor of Revelation and consequently of the Truth.

Without the assistance of Revelation man cannot reach, with certainty and "*nullo admixto errore*", even the most elementary truths concerning God, himself, his own destiny, etc. Without the light of revelation, he has fallen and will always fall into the most trivial and the grossest of errors.

These, of course, aren't merely opinions; they are Truths of Faith, explicitly or implicitly taught by the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council, and in some ways also by the earlier Councils as well. Let us not forget the truths relative to Original Sin, which has grievously wounded the entire man, nor should we forget that it is impossible for man to reach the end for which he was created without the light of Revelation and without the Grace which comes from Christ, from His redemptive and sanctifying Sacrifice.

Man needs to be redeemed, saved, purified, sanctified, and led to God. Man is a sinner. Without the Grace of God, although not everything which he does is evil and worthy of condemnation, nevertheless, he cannot avoid committing the sin which separates him from God and which places him outside the context of the love of God.

These sacred truths must ceaselessly and at all times "*opportune et importune*", be proclaimed, must be spelled out, preached and taught by the Church. No voice is more certain, more universal and surer than that of Peter, which comes to us in the words, the preaching, and the teaching of his Successors.

It is the eminent mission of Peter's Successor to remind the man of today in a universal and effective way—man who experiences in a particularly acute way the temptation to think himself to be self-sufficient, to be the architect of his destiny, the source and creator of his own future, and of his own happiness—that there is no salvation for him, no true happiness, no real meaning to his own existence without God, without Christ, and consequently, without the Church.

It is eminently his mission to open the eyes of man to the danger of allowing himself to be incapsulated in materialism, in agnosticism, in subjectivism, in relativism; to save him from the danger of believing in the theories of those who pretend to find in the world sufficient reason for its own existence, of those who claim to know (obviously without a real scientific or philosophical foundation) that man is only the product of a ceaseless evolutionary process of development.

How easy it is to verify—for those who have eyes to see and intellect to understand—that he who does not accept the light of Revelation gropes hopelessly in darkness, cannot escape from error.

The Church must constantly bring all this to the attention of the world, to those who do not have the Faith, but it is the Church itself which needs to be reminded in each and every member, of these definitive truths, must be strengthened in the Faith, in that Faith which in its divine, supernatural reality, it carries in its own heart without danger that it can be irretrievably lost from sight or forgotten. This is the mission of Peter.

It is not sufficient for error to be uncovered, refuted, and condemned. It is necessary that the fundamental Truths derived from Revelation are constantly preached, brought to the fore, offered to the minds of the faithful and to all men, so that they may be accepted, received, understood, believed, so that they may become the light and the way for all believers, so that they may influence the action and the life of individuals and of human communities, families, groups, organisations, civil society, international community, etc.; that they may lead towards the attainment of the fullness of the Truth in eternal life.

GUARANTOR OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

3. Summarising now some consequences from the fact that Peter is the foundation and visible principle of the Church of Christ, we can say: there can be no true and authentic Church, in its fullness, other than the Church of Christ founded upon Peter. There can be no authentic Faith which is not the Faith of Peter and the other Apostles. Nothing in the Church can be done outside its foundation — outside Peter. "*Nihil sine Petro, nihil contra Petrum — omnia cum Petro et sub Petro, quia ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia et ubi Ecclesia ibi Christus*".

In the same way that there can be no Church without a Bishop (without a true Successor to the Apostles — "*sine Episcopo Ecclesia non datur*"—), so there can be no "Collegiality" and no *Communio*, no fullness of the One and Unique Church of Christ *sine Petro*, without effective and true communion with the Successor of Peter, because "*ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia*". There can be no full, true and legitimate Apostolic Succession without authentic and full communion with the Successor of Peter. He is the ultimate visible Guarantor of the true and legitimate Apostolic Succession.

This point is authoritatively recalled by John Paul II in his very recent Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church asking for prayers for the Catholics of China:

"Itaque vinculum cum Sede Petri eiusque apostolico ministerio pronaecessaria est condicio ut quis unitatem cum magna familia catholica particeper".

Everything, that the Church is and does, has a basic relation to Peter; in all truth we can say that Peter, in his role as the foundation of the Church, represents, personifies and carries in himself the whole Church. One can also say that the mission of Peter is identical with that of the Church, that the Church can do nothing more than, or different from, that which Peter Himself accomplishes. Nothing is outside the scope of Peter's mission. When Peter acts, the Church itself is acting and Christ Himself is acting.

All of this is true also of Peter's Successor, but obviously only when and to the extent that he acts in his capacity as the Successor of Peter and that this is clearly

understood; it must be clear that he, in his action, is fulfilling his role as Successor of Peter in all its fulness and plenitude.

SUPREME AUTHORITY OVER ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE

4. Finally, I shall limit myself to recalling only one of the consequences which derive from the fact that the Successor of Peter is the Pastor of the whole flock of Christ.

This context includes the making of laws, recalling everyone to their observance, making it clear that he who does not accept and observe them cannot pretend to have the same position in the Church as he who is faithful, and who lives — or at least tries to live — according to the lights given through the Church's wise guidance and her ecclesiastical discipline.

Inherent in the notion of law is that of penalty. Therefore the use of penalties, pre-eminently spiritual in character, belongs to the nature of the Church. There is perhaps nothing which requires such wisdom and such pastoral sensitivity as the proper use of penalties in the Church's life. But such a use is appropriate to a community composed of sinners, of the good and the bad. And it is the height of injustice and pastoral foolishness to treat indiscriminately between a man who does objective good for the Church and the man who creates embarrassment, who does actual damage, who gives rise to scandal, causes real difficulty, and who wreaks havoc and ruin. It is essential to differentiate between the man who preaches the true Faith and the man who seeks to sow error.

The Successor of Peter is the supreme moderator of the use of penalties within the Church. He is, of course, the supreme authority over ecclesiastical discipline since as the Supreme Pastor he is also the Supreme Legislator.

CONCLUSION

Finally two simple considerations:

(a) It must never be forgotten that the entire activity of the Church, as is the case with everything that the Suc-

cessor of Peter and the other Ministers in communion with him accomplish in the sphere of teaching, in the administration of the Sacraments and in Government, is directed to the interior communion of Grace and of Divine Life, in order that man may become capable of reaching God in eternal life, where he will be able to see Him face to face and to adhere to Him in perfect love. Everything in the Church is effected for the eternal Salvation of man, to the Glory of God.

(b) The Authority of the Church, of its Ministers and in particular of the Successor of Peter is, accordingly, a service leading to Salvation. As such it must be accepted and welcomed with an open heart, with a grateful spirit, with the submission of the intellect and the will. For it is a supernatural service, and not a human one. It represents and communicates to us the action of God and as such must be suitably considered and received.

There is no Salvation for man except in the Mystery of the Incarnation, there is no access to such a Mystery if not in the Church of Christ, if not in the human acceptance by mind and heart of the Word of Revelation and the Grace of Redemption which reaches us through the Tradition safeguarded intact in the Church of Peter, which is the Church of Rome.

This article has been published in pamphlet form jointly by the **APOSTOLATE OF CATHOLIC TRUTH** and **PRO FIDE**.

Further information on the aims and objects of these two apostolates may be obtained from :

Apostolate of Catholic Truth,
Mr. P. F. X. Swarbrick,
Ribbleton,
Preston PR2 6DP,
Lancashire.

Pro Fide,
Mr. P. J. Finigan,
7 Bingham Road,
Croydon CR0 7EA,
Surrey.

Further copies of this pamphlet may be obtained from either of the above addresses price 50p each.

We reproduce here yet one more Address from those given at the Preston meeting in September, 1982, under the auspices of "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice". In its course, a young teacher of Religious Education describes her own experiences in Scotland as student and teacher; and draws her own conclusions.

Catechetics : A Teacher's Experience

MARGARET FITZPATRICK

MY best approach would be, I think, to describe some of my experiences over the past decade and the way in which they throw light on the teaching of religion north of the border. Let me recall my first encounter with the new catechetics. At about the same time I was a fifteen-year-old secondary pupil preparing for the Diocesan Religious Written Education Examination. Soon after the course of study began, the Diocesan authorities announced that the Diocesan Examination had been discontinued. From that day the books were closed and for the next two years I and my classmates learned little about our religion. All teaching stopped and lessons were replaced by vague and rather direction-less discussions of contemporary affairs.

At Teacher's Training College

Four years after leaving school I attended one of the Catholic Colleges of Education in Scotland—a college run by an order of nuns with a number of lay members of staff. During that year I studied for the Secondary Teaching Certificate and the Catholic Teachers' Certificate of Religious Education.

As at school, there were no examinations for the Religious Education Certificate. Students were, however, expected to prepare a discussion paper on a selected topic in the final term. Before enrolling I had been told by past

students at the college that Religious Education there left a good deal to be desired; but I was still unprepared for what followed.

To begin with, the lecturer in Scripture and Theology told us that several of the key documents of Scripture and Tradition needed to be demythologised. The Book of Genesis, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Canons of the Council of Trent. He claimed that any worthwhile discussion of original sin must be based on acceptance of the theory of Evolution and of polygenism. And, he asserted that the soul was not the direct creation of God; thus denying a crucial point on which Pope Pius XII insisted in his Encyclical *Humani Generis*.

As far as the Holy Eucharist was concerned, he claimed that the term Transubstantiation should be dropped in favour of a more relevant term: transignification. I taped and transcribed this lecturer's treatment of the Eucharist in which he had appealed to several well-known and fashionable contemporary writers. I then sent the text of the lecture to a scholarly priest and asked him to comment on it. He replied that he was unhappy about some of the contents and returned the text with a series of questions which he advised me to put to the lecturer for the purpose of clarification. This I did. The text of the lecture together with the answers to the questions were sent back to me by the lecturer in due course with various comments in the margin such as: "Who said this"? and "Who mentioned these names"? One would think that he did not recognise his own words. But, in fact, the text was a word for word transcript. The written answers to the questions incidentally were so orthodox that they could not be faulted. Clearly he was not prepared to stand by these theses he had defended in class once they had become known in wider circles. My impression is that a good many catechetical experts are now rather more brazen in advancing novel and unorthodox views.

In June the following year I was awarded my Catholic Teachers' Certificate in R.E. which stated that I had "successfully completed a one year course in religious education and in the practice of teaching religion". This was, in part, quite inaccurate because I had not been sent to a

Catholic school for teaching practice and, therefore, had not taught a single religious lesson.

The Course Ends in Confusion

At the end of the College course, some students told me that, as a result of the lectures on doctrine, they were so confused about their faith and about what they should teach that they would rather not teach R.E. and would be prepared instead to teach in non-Catholic schools.

Of course, it is one thing to describe what was wrong at this and other Catholic Institutions but quite another to account for it. It is sometimes suggested or implied that, by contrast, the teaching of religion was completely satisfactory in the years preceding Vatican II; but I am inclined to doubt it. If everything had been satisfactory then surely I and my fellow students could not have reached the situation whereby, in less than one year, the beliefs we had held since leaving school could be so thoroughly shaken. How was it that we could not effectively challenge the un-Catholic material that was being fed to us? The answer is, I think, that we knew what the truths were but could not elaborate on them in any detail, or defend them. We were at the battle-front in a Catholic College of Education; but we were without weapons. Those who tried to argue with the lecturer found that he tended to brush their objections aside. At the end of the session on the Origins of Man and Original Sin, the lecturer had been speaking in a way clearly in favour of polygenism—rejected by Pope Pius XII in *Humani Generis*, he challenged us with the question “Does anyone here still believe in Adam and Eve”? No-one dared raise his or her hand. I am sure some did believe in the existence of our first parents — I certainly did — but I did not answer him.

I was fortunate in being able to turn to my parents and my parish priest who did know how to defend the truths of their faith. They kept me on the right path. They showed an interest in what was going on. They were prepared to listen. This parental support and preparedness to listen seems to me of the utmost importance. In many cases parents have regrettably abandoned their responsibility for their children's religious upbringing.

Years as a Teacher

For five years I was in charge of the personal guidance of a year-group of about 200 pupils as they progressed through High School. Troublesome pupils who were referred to me often confessed to me that their parents hardly ever spoke to them or that the family was rarely together at home. In most cases, both parents were working and they simply did not have the time to talk over any matters of importance, let alone religious matters. How many parents ask their children what they are being taught in their R.E. lessons? Over the years, I have put that question to 150 pupils in five classes. Only five said their parents had asked them about their progress in R.E. For too long parents have simply trusted that the school was doing its job in inculcating the truths of the Faith and of correct moral principles. They took too much for granted. Teachers must accept some of the blame for allowing the present situation to develop in our schools, it is true. Many do not take a critical attitude to the catechetical novelties. It is so much easier to agree with the outpourings of visiting catechetical nomads than it is to challenge them. Admittedly, however, it is difficult for an orthodox and independent-minded teacher to criticise these novelties if he finds that exactly the same type of unsound teaching is being championed by the Diocesan Religious Educational Authority and this is sadly all too often the case.

At staff meetings it is easy to feel intimidated when the catechetical specialist marches in — a smiling man who, while welcoming the teachers, produces from his briefcase a number of large and impressive looking volumes. Without saying so, the impression is given: "What a well-read fellow I am"! I admit to having felt intimidated in such situations. However, sometimes the apparently expert specialist can be challenged. On one occasion a liturgical adviser arrived, armed with, among other things, a complete set of Vatican II documents bearing almost as many page markers as there were pages. I had with me the same book. He quoted the first paragraph of Article 54 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* in order to support his claim that the participation of Catholic laypeople in the Mass could have little place for the sort of solemnity which could

come from the use of the Latin language and Gregorian chant. The paragraph is as follows: "In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to the mother tongue. This provision is to apply in the first place to the readings and the common prayer but also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts of the Mass which pertain to the people according to the norm laid down in Article 36 of this Constitution". In reply I quoted the very next paragraph of the same article: "Nevertheless, steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them" and asked for his comments.

The liturgical adviser looked bewildered. There was silence for the first time in a very long period. He asked for the source of the quotation. When I told him it was the paragraph following that which he had read, he was rather embarrassed. However, he quickly recovered his composure and answered that my paragraph was no longer relevant as it referred to the liturgy we had in the early 1960's. We had progressed since then, he said. He then addressed the rest of the staff and said: "Does anyone here really want to discuss this"? Three did, nine did not—so that was that!

No Solution in Isolation

Ultimately, I am convinced that there can be no solution to the catechetical problem in isolation from the other problems which we have been discussing including liturgy and moral teaching. Until, for instance, we have a Catholic liturgy which unambiguously reflects defined Catholic teaching on the Mass instead of lending itself to all sorts of purely man-centred celebrations, it is unlikely that instruction on the Sacrifice of the Mass will be at all adequate. And it is equally unlikely that Catholic teaching on issues such as birth control will be successfully passed on to children while the present lack of direction and discipline and the "doing one's own thing" attitude persists in Catechetics and Liturgy. For these reasons the orthodox Catholic is forced to fight on several fronts; but until all these problems are cleared up, our schools will continue to produce very poorly instructed children who are not truly at home in the Faith.

Working within the limits of what he describes as the practically possible, Father Crane sets out, in this concluding article, what he thinks of as the most effective way of meeting the contemporary neo-modernist assault on the Catholic Church.

CURRENT COMMENT

Secularization and the Protected Church : 4

THE EDITOR

SAINT Ignatius it was, long ago, who reminded us that we have to pray as if everything depended on God, which it does, and work as if everything depended on ourselves.

Prayer and Family Pressure

Last month I stressed as strongly as I could the need for prayer as the essential basis on which any successful thrust against contemporary neo-modernist secularism must be made to rest. I want to turn now to the work side of true renewal; to what is best called, perhaps, the strategy of the thrust itself. What this entails is the most apt disposition of available traditionalist forces in an endeavour to break the hold which contemporary neo-modernist secularism has on the Catholic Church in this country. This calls for a careful selection of the key areas of confrontation and the encouragement of traditionally-minded Catholics who are able and willing to do so, to enter these areas and struggle effectively within them without delay. I say this in the full realization that many who are willing to do this are unable to do so because of family duties that rightly claim their energy and time and should not be laid aside. They are right. Their action within the Church is within their families; and their families could and should

be brought to pray, as I pointed out last month. Their children can and should be instructed in the true basics of the Faith in default of that which ought to be given at school and is not given today. And there is a type of pressure—as again I tried to show in a previous article—which good Catholic families singly or, far better, grouped together can lay on in a parish with the help of God and with the kind of telling effect that brings a reawakening and with it renewed strength to other parishioners. This kind of quiet and courteous, yet firm, counter-action at parish level is open to all. Adopted on a wide scale, persisted in with steady courage, its effect within the Catholic Church in this or any country could be immense. It does not call for specialized, intellectual ability, but for the quiet fortitude that comes from prayer and through the Sacraments. As such, it is within every good Catholic's grasp. Link-ups by parish groups within a diocese would give the whole thing added and impressive strength. I would like to make it very clear that here I am not talking about the formation of a formalized movement, complete with a committee and sub-committees, elected officers and all the rest of it. This way what ought to be responsible for a dynamic and lasting—because, above all, prayerful—thrust within the Church would grind very soon into stagnation. This much said in general and, in my own view, vitally important terms, it is time to turn to particular and special areas of confrontation, which are meant for those who are not only willing, but able to enter them.

The Young Our Main Concern

Within these areas I suggest that our main concern must be with the young, not because they are particularly special, but because they are more likely than most to be specially open to neo-modernist influence, which offers them, in its secularist outpourings, a permissive and, where they are concerned, attractively relaxed way of Christianity, as a substitute for the way of the true Faith, which they should have been taught, but have not been by reason of the default of those who should have taught them the truth, but have not done so. What they have none is substitute for it a man-centred humanism with what is called "conscience"

—which too often turns out in practice to be no more than private judgment—as guide. The young are left with the impression in the end that life is what you make it. Your life is in your own hands and nobody else's. The inevitable accompaniment of this kind of thinking is a disregard of Religious Authority, which is seen as preventing you from making your life what you want it to be, running it in your own way and on your own terms. Out of this comes a loss of that sense of the supernatural, which is cardinal to true Christian living and, in the wake of this, a diminished consciousness of sin. Life is yours to lead as you will; existentialist impulse is all. The picture is sad, but not unfair. Neither is it portrayed with the object of blaming the young. Blame must be laid with justice on those who teach and taught them. What then, are we to do?

Need and Longing for Certainty of Belief

Part of the remedy lies, as already suggested, with the home. But not the whole of it and for this reason, that parents cannot be expected—given the load of family living they carry already and, so often, so well—to apply themselves, in what spare moments they have, to that in-depth study of dogmatic and moral teaching which is often required to answer adequately the questions posed from time to time by their growing, teen-age children. The more so when one realises that children of twelve to fourteen today are inclined to put questions and pose real difficulties which, twenty or thirty years ago, would not have been asked by sixth-formers or those in their second year at university or polytechnic. The gap is pronounced and it has left the young of today marooned in relative isolation; the prey, in consequence, of those who offer them what appears as certainty in commitment to any of a number of contemporary ideologies, cults and so-called creeds. The young of today, I think, are not at base for aimless drift which ends so soon in disillusion. Their search, however subconscious, is for something that brings both purpose and a focal point to their lives. Neither are they afraid of sacrifice in its service. This they prefer, for it brings reality to their living, making of it something worth doing. It is no

surprise that Baptist Fundamentalism with its call for commitment to Christ and all that is said to entail by way of life-style, is winning more converts in the United States at present than any other religion. There is nothing soft about it. It provides its own certainty of belief. It is in no way permissive. Its endeavour is to draw the young up to itself; in no way to come down to their level. This is what the best of the young want. This is what teachers—religious, clerical and lay—in the Catholic Church at the level of parish and school, university and polytechnic are not giving them. This is why they are drifting away in shoals. According to a recent survey, as I have indicated already, 55 per cent. of Catholic teenagers cease going to Mass by the time they are twenty. I am in no way surprised.

What to Do

What then, do we do? Always remembering that—with the exception of some fine priests and religious who are wholly with them in these matters—the laity are more or less completely on their own. This is the fact that I am trying to keep constantly in my mind as I write these lines. There is little point in my saying that teachers in the Catholic Church in this country should do this or do that, if I know perfectly well that they will not do it and that, as far as I can see, Ecclesiastical and Religious Authority will not compel them to do it. What remains is for the laity to bring pressure on them to do it, assisted, whenever possible, by those few fine priests and religious who are with them in this matter. This is the point to which we have come. By default, the initiative has passed to the laity. This has to be recognised for a start. It is from this realization that we start. I have four suggestions to make.

In the First Place

In the first place, those good and courageous parents who have children at school on the receiving end of wrong-headed or non-existent religious instruction and who have taken up the cudgels on their children's behalf, should continue to do so and be given every assistance in this vital task. Hopefully, they will be able to associate other parents with them in their campaign. Their basic difficulty, perhaps,

lies in their lack of what might be called professional theological and/or philosophical knowledge, which is at times essential to the successful conduct of the brave effort they are making. Traditionally-minded and competent priests and religious who have this knowledge are not so much hard to find as hard to get at because they are under increasing pressure of work, which prevents them giving the time required, if they are to be of real and effective assistance to those brave parents in the Church in this country today, who are struggling so hard on behalf of their children's Faith. On the other hand, there may well be others who are as yet unknown, yet willing to give what help they can. It is greatly to be hoped that groups of Catholic parents engaged in this battle on their children's behalf will make a great effort to see if these good priests can make themselves available; on tap, so to say, to help them in their need. In the last analysis, it could be that the question resolves itself into one of link-up and co-ordination, which is lacking at the moment.

In the Second Place

In the second place and in line with what has just been said, it is essential that every text-book and set of roneoed sheets concerned with Catechetics and in use in Catholic schools and institutes of further education be subjected to careful examination—again by two or three priests who are equipped for this kind of task and prepared to devote themselves to it. The kind of job done by Father Godfrey Carney with a diocesan syllabus and described last month in *Christian Order* needs to be repeated. It is by no means unlikely that some able, traditionally-minded priests, retired or discarded prematurely by higher Teaching Authority, would be prepared to do this work. They should be sought out and asked to do it. I think they would. Here, we may be far richer in resources than we think. This work of the codification of teaching error in contemporary Catechetics is vital. Encouragement to pursue it is given by the recent condemnation, by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of the heterodox catechetical text, *Christ Among Us* by Anthony Wilhelm, a former priest; and the command given to Bishop Peter Gerety of Newark, New Jersey, USA,

that he should remove his *Imprimatur* from this book forthwith. He complied. The point we should note in this context is that the suppression of this widely used catechetical text was in response to the persistent thrust of complaints sent to Rome by orthodox Catholic groups in the United States concerning the book's deviations from true Catholic dogmatic and moral teaching. The complaints were accompanied by the requisite documentation. It is essential that this be noted. This response of the Holy See should give us great hope and encourage us to do likewise. But, first, the search for a priest or priests who love the Church and who are willing and able to assist in this vital operation. Again, link-up and co-ordination are required.

In the Third Place

In the third place — still with the young in mind and working within the framework of what has been said with regard to Catechetics — there would seem to be a great and pressing, positive and parallel further need. It is that a central course of instruction dealing very clearly with the dogmatic and moral teaching of the Church, whilst taking account at the same time of contemporary neo-modernist error, should be given in London as soon as humanly possible. For reasons already given, the course should be aimed primarily at the young, whilst remaining open to all. It should be taped and the tapes made available throughout the United Kingdom, so that the true teaching of the Church may be carried to all who want not only to hear it, but *to make use of it*. Those who attend the central course should make a point of attending catechetical lectures and courses wherever and whenever they can, with a view to challenging openly and firmly the erroneous doctrinal and moral teaching that typifies many of them. What they should watch for with special care is the underlying secularist trend that runs through so many of these courses — away from the supernatural and into a man-centred humanism that passes these days for religion in too many Catholic circles. Finally, let those who have had the benefit of this central course—live or on tape—and who have backed what they have heard by reading and study and serious discussion, form groups with their friends

where the course they themselves have gone through is repeated once again. This way the real truth spreads and serves as an effective counter to prevailing neo-modernist error.

In the Fourth Place

Fourthly and finally — within the context of the needs of the rising generation, but without being intended wholly for them — there is the question of liturgy; above all of the Mass. Let us remember that 55% of the Catholics included in the teen-age sample (of which 49% was Catholic) investigated by Dr. Leslie Francis and already referred to, ceased attending church by the age of 20. Without overpressing the point, one is entitled to conclude, I suggest, that this provides reasonable evidence of the failure of the New Liturgy within the Catholic Church to attract and hold the young (and so very many of the middle-aged and old as well) as the Old succeeded in doing. In this it has failed and the reason the New Liturgy has failed is to be found in the fact that, in practice, it has *consciously and of set purpose sought so often to attract*. This should never have been tolerated, for the primary purpose of the liturgy is not *to entertain man, but to give due honour and worship to God*. Let this be done as it should with all the reverence it can command and the rest will follow. Instead, let it be turned to the pleasure and attraction of man, which it makes its first purpose, and its primary objective, which is the honour and worship of God, will go. As such, it will no longer attract man because it will serve no longer as a true and full expression of his belief in the omnipotence of God and his own total dependence on his Creator. It will stand, at the very least, in derogation of both these tremendous truths. As such, it will not satisfy men whose basic yearning is for divine truth in its fullness and for worship, not by way of attraction, but as an expression of the sublime splendour of that fullness. "Our hearts are made for Thee, oh God", wrote the great Augustine, "and they are restless until they repose in Thee".

The Mass is supreme sacrifice offered to God by His Son in the person of His priest. As such, it is without equal among men. It stands peerless in its own right. Its offering

can call only for awe and mystery and deepest reverence in acknowledgement of man's essence, implicit in the offering, as totally dependent on God. It is for this that he yearns. This is what holds him, precisely because it expresses the need — set deep within the created being that he is — to empty himself out before his Creator, to divest himself of himself in supreme sacrifice offered to God. Thus it is that the Mass must remain God-centred; otherwise it falters and fails. To turn it towards the supposed needs of man, even at peripheral level and in order to attract him, is to set it on this path. Under such circumstances, it is no longer expressive of deepest basic belief, but of its derogation. Instinctively, men are no longer attracted by its new—however lightly—man-centred form. They tend to drop away from what they recognise instinctively as no longer expressive adequately of the longing implicit in deepest belief.

The Old Mass and Western Culture

I am aware, of course, of cultural differences here. I am not competent to deal with them. Moreover, any attempt to do so would go beyond the scope of this article, which is concerned with this country. What I would suggest, however, is that, so far as Western Europe is concerned, the Old Mass is, in fact, part and parcel of its cultural heritage and has been such for several hundred years. This is no mean length of time. The Old Mass lies deep-rooted in the whole cultural heritage of the West. What the innovators have engaged in, then, with whatever good intention, is not a process of culturalization, but its reverse. They have de-cultured the remains of the Christian West, depriving it of the great and wonderful thing which served, at one and the same time, as the focal point of its worship and the heart of its civilization. There lies tragedy, not only for the Catholic Church in the West, but for the countries of Latin America, associated with it for so long; also for those of North America and what we may call for want of a better word, the white countries of the Commonwealth. The roots of their Catholic people are in the Old Mass. Why, then, banish it from their midst? So far as the Catholic Church in the West concerned, what the innovators have

done—however good their intention—is to pluck out its heart. Restoration, clearly, is a matter of supreme importance. Without it the rest will go. What then do we do? Work without ceasing for the restoration of the Old Mass on a basis of parity of esteem with the New.

Example of the Latin Mass Society

We might begin by taking fresh hope from what has been accomplished in this country in this regard. And fresh hope comes from what has been accomplished by the Latin Mass Society. Their example is one of persevering courage in the face of many obstacles over the years since their foundation. Working within the guide-lines of the Indult obtained by Cardinal Heenan from the Holy See the Society has extended its reach widely throughout England and Wales. As it has done so, its membership has steadily increased, and it is to be noted with care that its increase is made up notably and noticeably of a growing proportion of the young. Some would call this surprising. I would not. It is what I would expect. I would think, then, that, in the context of what has already been said, it is extremely important that readers of *Christian Order* in England and Wales should join the Latin Mass Society without delay; that they should attend the Old Mass, within the guidelines of the Indult, wherever and whenever possible and that they should do their best, through the good offices of the Society, to bring it to their own parts of this country. What I am saying here appears to me to apply particularly to young parents of young families. It is important that their children who have never known the Old Mass, should become acquainted with it and, as it were, grow up and into a longing for it from their earliest years. This could well be the best means of saving their Faith; the “kindly light” in their lives that will lead them out of the “encircling gloom” of contemporary secularism that darkens all. I would hope that as many of those who can would join the Latin Mass Society without delay; not because the Society needs their money, but because the Catholic Church in this country needs from them and their children today the kind of vibrant faith that draws its dynamism from the tradition of the past. Enquiries with regard to the Latin Mass

Society should be sent to the Hon. Sec., Latin Mass Society, 3 Cork Street, Mayfair, London W1X 1HA; Phone: 01-434-2685.

So far as I know, membership of the Latin Mass Society stands today at approximately 6000. Were it doubled or trebled within the next twelve months, the effect within the Catholic Church in England and Wales would be a good deal more than noteworthy. The efforts of the Society — working always within the Indult — are noted now by Ecclesiastical Authority in this country. They would have to be not merely noted, but subject to the most careful consideration by that same Authority, as the ranks of the Society swelled. This is what we need. And why? Because the restoration of the Faith needs the restoration of the Old Mass as its centre-piece and core, not only here, but throughout the Western World. With this, I think, enough has been said. Deeds are what is required.

The Practically Possible

Much more could be said under the four points noted above and others that could be added. But I set myself the task, at the outset of this essay, of writing, within the limits of the *practically* possible. Energy is wasted if resources are dissipated and the effect of too many suggestions is to do just that. I am of the opinion that a canalizing of energies along the lines suggested in this article would have a notable restorative effect on the Catholic Church in this country as we know it today. The least we can do is try. I am content, for the time being, to leave things at that.

(Concluded)

GIVING OURSELVES

When suffering torments in our life, when the following of Christ costs much and the cross weighs heavily on our shoulders, one must be aware that love reaches its highest expression in suffering, in sacrifice, and in the giving of self. Souls are saved on Calvary.

Pope John Paul II.

This account of Father Robert Parsons, the English Jesuit, brief though it is, conveys a true picture of one of the very greatest of the missionary priests, who came to England in the reign of Elizabeth I in a gallant effort to try and save the Faith.

Father Robert Parsons, S.J.

MONICA KING

ROBERT Parsons was born at Nether Stowey, Somersetshire, in the year 1546. His parents were poor west-country folk who had eleven children. Robert was the sixth. From an early age he showed signs of above-average intelligence, but his father, who was supposed to have been a blacksmith, could not afford to pay for his education. The local parish priest, however, came to the rescue and saw to it that the boy was sent to the free school at Taunton. It is quite probable that this priest was one who conformed to the Act of Uniformity, or to give it its full title, 'An act for the uniformity of common prayer and divine service in the church, and the administration of the sacraments'. The second Edwardian Prayer Book was adopted despite the fact that Queen Elizabeth herself would have preferred the first one to remain because she considered it less offensive to her Catholic subjects. It may have been she herself who authorised the omission of the words in the Litany of the second Prayer Book which went as follows: "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities . . . Good Lord, deliver us." For at that time, prior to her excommunication, Elizabeth was still a moderate. However, things were gradually changing, and priests who refused to use the second Edwardian Prayer Book were liable to the loss of their emoluments for one year and imprisonment for six months. A second offence meant a term of imprisonment for one year with the loss of benefice; a third offence meant life imprisonment.

Oxford

In 1564 Parsons went to St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, becoming a Fellow of Balliol College in 1568. He had by this time taken the oath required of University dons on two separate occasions, but was now beginning to have misgivings about it and a leaning towards Catholicism. This was sufficient for the University Authorities to cut short his career at Oxford. As he was afterwards to write :

"Whatever we had heard or conceived in the whole day for pulling out this thorn of conscience, and for smoothing the way to be Protestant, either by good fellowship and conversation with Protestants themselves, or by hearing their sermons or reading their books, all this was dashed by one hour's reading of the old holy doctors, and the wound of conscience was made green again. . ."⁽¹⁾

Having left Oxford, Parsons then went to London with a view to studying medicine, but was advised to do this in Padua which was the leading medical school of the day. By some strange coincidence, the facts of which are not fully known, Parsons broke his journey at Louvain where he made the Spiritual Exercises with a Fr. William Good. Presumably it was here that he was fully reconciled to the church. He eventually reached Padua in the Spring of 1575, but after two or three months of the medical school he began to feel a call to the priesthood. He therefore proceeded to Rome where he asked for admittance into the Society of Jesus. He was accepted, but we are told little of his progress during his years of training. There is no doubt, however, that he must have shown ability because before he had even completed his theological course he was appointed English penitentiary at St. Peter's about the year 1578.

The Jesuits and the English Mission

St. Ignatius, the founder of the Jesuit Order, died in 1556, the year after Elizabeth came to the throne. By that time the Order had expanded to a membership of over 1,000. Missionaries were being sent from Europe to Brazil, and as far afield as India. But at that particular time the Jesuits had no definite policy with regard to the English Mission. William Allen had opened the college in Rome in

1577, chiefly for a surplus of applicants from Douai College. The English College consisted mainly of secular students for the priesthood, and they tended to feel that being under Jesuit control they were automatically being hindered from going to England. So Allen discussed the matter with the General of the Society, together with some other Jesuit priests, amongst whom was Robert Parsons. Several objections were put forward by the Jesuits to the idea of an English mission. They were as follows :

1. The English Government would accuse them of being there for political reasons only.
2. The Priests would have to be disguised and work in secret.
3. They would not be able to meet regularly for retreats which are an important part of Jesuit life.
4. There would be the danger of clashing with the secular priests who, at that time, had no bishop with jurisdiction over them.

Bishop Thomas Goldwell was therefore appointed for the task but he was a man in his late seventies and in poor health. Nevertheless, with the problem of a bishop more or less settled, the General of the Order, the Belgian Everard Mercurian agreed to the proposal of sending a few Jesuits to England. And so began what is often mistakenly referred to as the "Jesuit Invasion". It was no such thing. In actual fact, only two Jesuits were among the party of fifteen who set out from Rome. These were Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion who were accompanied by Ralph Emerson, a laybrother.

Parsons and Campion

Robert Parsons in the get-up of an army captain landed at Dover on 16th June, 1580, together with his companion, George, who was also suitably dressed. "Brother George", as he was called, was, in fact, Parson's brother, but it is not certain whether he was an ordained priest or a Jesuit laybrother.

Parsons having landed in England, Campion was waiting restlessly at St. Omer for news of him. To pass the time he wrote to the General thus :

"Fr. Robert, with Brother George his companion, sailed from Calais after midnight on the day before I began

writing this: the wind was very good, so we hope that he reached Dover some time yesterday morning, 16th June. He was dressed up like a soldier—such a peacock, such a swaggerer, that a man needs must have very sharp eyes to catch a glimpse of any holiness and modesty shrouded beneath such a garb, such a look, such a strut. Yet our minds cannot but misgive us when we hear all men, I will not say whispering, but crying the news of our coming. It is a venture which only the wisdom of God can bring to good, and to his wisdom we lovingly resign ourselves. According to orders, I have stayed behind for a time to try, if possible, to fish some news about certain merchants who are to come to these ports before I sail across. If I hear anything, I will advise upon it; but in any case I will go over and take part in the fight, though I die for it. . .”⁽²⁾

Campion must soon have had the news he was waiting for from Parsons. He set out immediately for Calais, and though delayed for want of a fair wind, crossed to Dover in the evening of the 24th June, together with Ralph Emerson. The exact itinerary of the two men cannot be known from their letters and reports which they sent to Rome as there had to be strict secrecy about place names. However, Parsons wrote the following to the Rector of the English College at Rome in August 1580.

“We are encountering many dangers — greater than those which are likely to be met with by those who come after us, seeing that they will have the benefit of many habitations arranged by us, and also because the enemy have a special hatred for us who are the first to come as precursors, and they are planning every sort of evil for us. . .” (C.R.S. XXXIX, pp. 41-6).

Both men moved about the country surreptitiously. In Campion’s words:

“I ride about some piece of the country every day. The harvest is wonderfully great. On horseback I meditate my sermon; when I come to the house, I polish it. Then I talk with such as come to speak with me; they hear with exceeding greediness, and very often receive the Sacrament. . .”⁽³⁾

The Printing Press

On top of these arduous journeys Parsons was much occupied in setting up his Printing Press, first in London, and later at Stonor Park which was provided by John Stonor and his widowed mother, Lady Cecil Stonor. Stonor Park which was about 40 miles west of London was surrounded by beechwoods, and contained out-of-the-way rooms and attics where priests could hide and find refuge. Here Parsons fulfilled what was probably the most significant part of his life. Born journalist as he was, he shared with Allen a belief in the printed word being circulated as quickly and as briefly as possible. The purpose was to refute heresies and encourage the Catholics of England. Parsons used many pseudonyms and found time to write as many as thirty books. As Fr. Richard Holtby, Campion's old friend reported from England :

"Though his books do not bear his name, yet he is recognised in them by all, even by his enemies and rivals. The elegance, propriety, gravity, and simplicity of his style have won for him, in the opinion of his very adversaries, a foremost place among English writers. I hear that the Earl of Salisbury, who is accounted the English 'Tully' has said so much." (Annual Letters. Foley Collectanea, Pt. 2. p. 983).

Some of Parsons' most famous works are a *Brief Discourse* and *Brief Censure*; also *De Persecutione Anglicana* and the *Christian Directory*. This latter work was reprinted no less than four times by Catholics, and fifteen times by Protestants. A bowdlerized version of it "free of all Catholic error and corruption" was published in 1584. The young John Gerard refers to it in his autobiography as follows :

"He (Parsons) had just arrived from England and was staying secretly in the city in order to complete his *Christian Directory* and to see it through the press — a most useful and wonderful book which, I believe, has converted more souls to God than it contains pages. Even the Protestants appreciated it very much as you can see from the recent edition brought out by one of their clergymen, who tried to steal the credit for it." (Gerard, *Autobiography*, pp. 2-3).

Campion Captured

However, the end was now in sight. Campion was discovered and apprehended at Lyford Grange in 17th July, 1581. Parsons was fortunately at Windsor at the time. It was now impossible for him to return to Stonor, so he took refuge at Michelgrove in West Sussex, the home of William Shelley who was then in the Fleet Prison. At Michelgrove, Parsons met a party of Catholics, including priests who were planning to escape from the country. They urged Parsons to join them. He agreed and left England never more to return. Much abuse was hurled at him for doing this and he was accused by some of the seminary priests of having "fled from the mission like a dastardly soldier consulting his own safety." But Parsons must be allowed to speak for himself and the explanation he gave to the General of the Society for leaving the country was as follows:

1581. "I wanted to report on the state of the mission to William Allen and to consult with him as to future policy.

"I wanted to set up a press in the Low Countries as experience showed that it was impossible to maintain and develop the production of books and pamphlets in England when it was necessary to move the heavy equipment from one secret place to another."

"I wanted to see Archbishop John Leslie of Ross in Paris where he represented Mary, Queen of Scots, in order to urge him to send missionaries to Scotland." (C.R.S. XXXIX, p. 107).

Parsons in Exile

Parsons was now in exile but still in close contact with his servant, Robert Alfield, who kept him up-to-date with the news from England and forwarded his mail to him. Parsons mentions this as follows:

"Today I have received two large bundles of letters sent from England by my servant and from them I learn that I am in great demand there by the Catholics; and for that reason I am impelled to hasten my return. . .⁽⁴⁾

But this was never to be. Although he had fully expected to be allowed to return to England, his Superiors decreed

otherwise. Not only did they fear his own capture but the possibility of further reprisals against the Catholics of that country. The grief that Parsons felt over this decision was expressed in a letter to the General when he heard of the arrest of Campion's devoted servant, Brother Ralph Emerson :

"The news of this happening has distressed us not a little. Yet when we consider that this is the purpose of this mission of ours, or at least an accident obviously incidental to it, we console one another with that hope of things eternal which the kindness of God bestows on us. Only in my case—to tell your Paternity the truth—does a slight feeling of sadness arise at times when I consider how many, indeed, nearly all of my comrades who set out together with me on this work (their number was 13) have attained their reward or are still undergoing their contst while I, alone, am left out for my sins." (Parsons to Acquaviva, 12th Nov., 1584 — C.R.S. Vol. 39, p. 258)

Robert Parsons (or Persons) died in 1610. The last request he made was that his most treasured possession—part of the rope which had bound Campion to the hurdle on his last journey to Tyburn—should be placed around his neck.

NOTES

- (1) *Campion and Parsons* by E. E. Reynolds; Sheed & Ward, 1980; p. 29.
- (2) *op. cit.* p. 71.
- (3) *op. cit.* p. 85.
- (4) *op. cit.* p. 129.

BOOKS

mentioned or reviewed in *Christian Order* are obtainable from the Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop, 4 Brownhill Road, Catford, London SE6 2EJ : Phone 01-461-0896.

Malcolm Muggeridge and Michael Davies continue their conversation. It centers this time on the roots of rationalism, which is destroying the West today and driving the Church down. By contrast, there stands the saintly figure of the indomitable and inimitable Mother Teresa.

Conversation Piece

2: ROOTS OF RATIONALISM: MOTHER TERESA

MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE, MICHAEL DAVIES

THERE'S a very, very radical statement by Newman I'd like to read you and see what you think of it. Newman said: "I came to the conclusion that there was no medium in true philosophy between atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below must embrace either the one or the other". And this, I'm sure, would be because of this principle of authority; that, in Protestant Christianity, a person in himself can be very, very devout and have a very good relationship with Our Lord but, if it comes down to the point where the Bible is your ultimate authority and you interpret the Bible yourself; in the end, your own mind is the ultimate authority by which you live. So ultimately, I think, Protestantism leads to rationalism.

MM: I think this is right. I think that it leads either to rationalism or to complete scepticism, because it becomes apparent that one's mind is not capable of undertaking what would be required, if from a purely personal point of view. And here I found great comfort from someone I admire very much, Pascal. He saw that the intellect, as such, was a cul de sac, and as he had one of the most brilliant intellects of his time, this was important evidence.

MD: Yes. And I think from your own experience this seems to have been something that has impressed

you. Another point which Newman made is that truth often lies in the extremes. He started off with the *via media* and he thought that was a good way between Catholicism and Protestantism, but I think that we're finding today that in many ways the *via media* just isn't practical. For example, with abortion. You can have an extreme position on one hand; that you can have abortion on demand. On the other hand, you can never have it. And then you can have the "reasonable" position in between, you have it when . . .

MM: With some exceptions.

MD: And I think in many cases where people have thought that the doctrine of the Catholic Church was very harsh, on say divorce, they often bring up examples—well suppose a couple get married and the man abandons his wife after a year, should she have to live the rest of her life in a celibate state? But then, if one gives way to that, what about a man who leaves his wife after thirteen months or after fifteen months or after two years. And the moment you break this absolute, apparently harsh principle, we've now reached the position where I think in America, the divorce rate is getting on for fifty per cent . . .

MM: Here, too.

MD: And I know, as a teacher, in teaching young children, you can always pick out the children from divorced families in class, you can see they're always looking for attention and they're easily upset, they burst into tears . . .

MM: Yes, yes.

MD: . . . and I think it's very frightening for society if divorce does have these adverse effects on children. If we're going to have a society where over half the children are from divorced families . . .

RM: We're not going to have a *society*.

MM: And we're approaching that point, we're approaching that point now.

MD: . . . and the same with the subject of contraception. The Catholic Church has always said that the act of procreation should always be open to life. That has been denied, and logically it's now led to the acceptability of practically every form of perversion.

MM: Certainly. Well this is what brought me in. It was the realisation, especially in the person of the present Pope—he never wavered, and he upset the American hierarchy enormously on his visit by not wavering in any way. What you've just said, I entirely agree with. Unless you have enough respect for life to write off the whole idea of contraception, the whole idea that eroticism can be a pursuit irrespective of its purpose, which is procreation; and of its condition, which is lasting love . . . That is absolutely true and it was that, as much as anything, that made me feel that I must at the end of my days stand up and be counted with this Church which alone, alone in the whole world, defends the principle. Of course, there are many priests and many monsignors and people who don't, and who talk a lot of nonsense about compassionate views and so on. Compassion has become a word that I shudder over. It's the cloak of every kind of evil thing.

MD: It's rather like, it's got a special meaning. Now if you say "adult", if you see a shop that says adult books, you know what it means.

MM: You know exactly what it means.

MD: If you take a compassionate view, it means to tolerate every vile thing one can think of.

MM: After all, the Western World is destroying itself, isn't it? Patently destroying itself. And this business of believing in overpopulation and believing in contraception and abortion and all that goes with it is a very large element in that destruction and, in point of fact, it's probably reached a pitch now when, even if you could persuade people against it, it would be impossible to reverse the process.

MD: It almost, in some ways, has become an industry, with the pornography, really . . .

MM: We're going to give it another great boost here with cable television. That's what cable television is for.

MD: I've been very interested in how we've had it in this country—and in America it's happening now—some of the militantly anti-Catholic women's liberation groups are now coming out very strongly against pornography, because the people who are speaking out in defence of pornography are often very eminent liberal people in the

defence of freedom of speech and that you should be able to publish what you like. These women's groups are now seeing really that pornography is the exploitation of women and now, of course, sadly the exploitation of children and, as you say, our society seems to be absolutely destroying itself.

MM: And visibly doing so.

RM: Also it is true to say that the Church, in the loose sense of that word is destroying itself in the West. But I don't think that you can conclude that — obviously you can't think, if you're a Catholic, that the Church will die, but that individuals and perhaps, as in the days of the Arian heresy, even the vast majority of bishops and indeed even the Pope, one Pope in those days was weak and . . .

MM: Yes.

RM: . . . and was condemned for being weak about fighting the Arians. Even they can fail without it being said that the Church will die. And you mentioned earlier that the bishops largely were no inspiration to you but . . .

MM: Putting it mildly.

RM: . . . but it's also true to say that the very fact that we see failure on the part of bishops, successors to the Apostles, can lead you to a stronger faith in a way, because it forces you to confront the whole tradition that is the Church.

MM: Well, certainly if you throw your mind back and think of what you would have thought of the prospects of the Russian Orthodox Church after 1917, you would have said it's got no future at all. Many people did. But its future is absolutely, is precisely because it has managed in the most appalling circumstances to maintain, and perhaps not even consciously but through circumstances, to maintain its position and now, in their desperation, people are turning to it, as they did in the war. It's one of the incidents that never receive any publicity particularly, but was extremely interesting, that in the darkest moment of the war, from the point of view of Russia, when the German Army was 40 miles from Moscow and a similar distance from Leningrad, what did Stalin do? He didn't have readings from *Das Kapital* or anything like that. He fetched out from the camps the old hierarchy and set it up.

MD: Yes, and he reverted to the Holy Mother Russia idea.

MM: Absolutely. In fact, the truth is of course that Stalin *is* the counter-revolution. He'll be seen in history books, his role, as being the counter-revolution. He destroyed completely the revolution that took place. But that's a separate issue and, in a sense, just being history, it's not important because history, as such, is not particularly important. Truth is important. And I still believe that this amazing Church that has been a repository of truth with enormous ups and downs over many centuries will continue to be that; and you can detect the signs of it in today's extraordinary issues. In the same way that it set it's face against usury, which is an amazing piece of insight; and, of course, if you ever want to annoy leftist people you can always say to them that, if only the people had been up to supporting their Catholic Church, there would have been no capitalist system, because you couldn't have had a capitalist system without usury. And again, the Church's caution over things like chloroform. I mean that you don't rush into this thing. You don't say that, because you can make people not suffer anything in operations, you want to be cautious, you want to be careful about it. I build on all that, and now in our time, *Humanae Vitae* is the most amazing, amazing gesture to have been made in the circumstances of the twentieth century. Even though many eminent Catholics have not really, either overtly or covertly, supported it. But it was an extraordinary step to take, against the whole trend of things. Of course, Mother Teresa does the same thing, you see. She is the complete contradiction of the population explosion.

RM: Why does the media make — at least in America, I don't know about over here — such a big thing of Mother Teresa? She is a sign of contradiction to them. But every time she starts convents in Washington and in the South Bronx, it's a great news item, but they never fail . . . she seems to be an exception to the rule. What's the reason?

MM: I think it's because there are always two motives at work in the media, and one is the simple fact of attract-

ing a large audience and Mother Teresa has always been in the position that, whatever you think about what she says, she attracts a large audience .

RM: And she helps the poor, and everybody's interested in that.

MM: Absolutely. Everybody thinks that's good. There are all sorts of things in her which you can present. There's a lot of other things in her that are seldom mentioned, but they're there. And she has miraculously, miraculously, had this now for several decades and has been completely uncorrupted by it.

RM: Is there a scenario in which you can see the media shutting off Mother Teresa from the world as they have Solzhenitsyn?

MM: Yes.

RM: I suppose if there were an evident miracle done in sight of the cameras, that would be it. After that, there'd be no more. But is there, what do you see happening in the crystal ball?

MM: They'd love it, they'd love it if they could discredit her. If there was some way in which she made some hideous error. There was a moment, for instance, when her sisters in Belfast in Northern Ireland, there was some person there, a senior Roman Catholic with the name Murphy, but everybody there has the name of Murphy, so that doesn't get you anywhere, but anyway he told her that her sisters were not welcome, and she immediately withdrew them. And there was a lot of talk about it and within the Catholic Church they started trying to work out a hostile attitude towards Mother Teresa, but she was in the clear really because you see — as I was tackled myself on the thing, by some Catholics, and I said — she's a very old-fashioned lady, and if she takes a vow, she keeps it, though it seems absolutely strange to you, and impossible even, but it is true that if she says that she will be obedient to a certain ecclesiastical hierarchy, she will be obedient to it. And of course she took them away, and then you'll find that some managed to go back and so on. She can deal with a situation like that so that she's never fallen into any of those traps, you see. When I

first realised what a wise person she was (as well as everything else) was that she would never accept any money from any government under any circumstances. This could be quite a considerable thing for her because she would get grants from the Government of India for her work for the lepers and all the children. But she'll never do it because she would be involved, if she did that, in situations that would damage and ultimately destroy her. It's very interesting. She's got a kind of second sense in all this. She's got her sisters into Communist countries — it's absolutely extraordinary — I mean into Zagreb and into East Berlin and so on; they've got in there and nothing's been said about it. So I wouldn't myself worry about her being discredited, but it would absolutely delight the media. Another thing, they tried to work up a thing when one of her houses in London was burnt down, do you remember that . . .

MD: Yes.

MM: . . . and there was a terrific to do about it because the sort of fire restrictions hadn't been properly worked out there. Anyway, she dealt with it, I thought, in a very marvellous way. She said, "We take a vow that we will never refuse anybody" and the woman who burnt the place down was an alcoholic who was not acceptable to any of the welfare places.

RM: If Ralph Nader had walked in he would have immediately cited her.

MD: I think the reason for that obviously, again, is because the basis for her whole apostolate is spiritual and she sees in every individual, however wretched or however much they've degenerated, a person with a soul that has an eternal destiny.

MM: She sees Christ. She said that you must see Him in every other human being. And, as a matter of fact, she's very funny sometimes because she naturally doesn't like abusing people but, like all of us, she dislikes some people rather more than others and if she dislikes somebody, she says he's Christ in very distressing disguise. That's a rather good device for a blameless piece of abuse, don't you think?

(to be continued)

At a time when Zimbabwe's leaders are calling their people to socialism, and some people see in this a conflict with Christian ideology, the Catholic Bishops of Zimbabwe have issued a pastoral statement to clarify the issues and 'inspire our evolving socialism with the Christian vision'. The statement was issued on New Year's Day.

Socialism and the Gospel

CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF ZIMBABWE

A YEAR ago we put before you a Christian vision of the future in our Pastoral Statement *Our Way Forward*.

The Church holds that man is the primary and fundamental criterion in assessing and establishing a true social order worthy of human beings: "man", we said, "taken in all his dimensions, physical, mental, individual, social and spiritual" (*Redemptor Hominis*, no. 14).

We acknowledge that socialism has inherited some elements from Christianity, but we also know that some forms of socialism do not agree with Christianity. It is therefore up to us, who believe in Christ, to inspire our evolving socialism with the Christian vision. We do this through dialogue and free cooperation with 'all men of good will' (Pope Paul V: *The Development of Peoples*) always bearing in mind, though, that the "Kingdom of God" is greater than any political, social or economic system.

In Zimbabwe socialism is understood to mean equality regardless of race, creed or sex, an equitable distribution of land, health care and education for all regardless of income; it means fair wages, a life-style of self-reliance as well as of sharing, the promotion of co-operative ways of production and a national policy of reconciliation.

To the extent that Government has in fact begun to implement these policies, we have expressed our full support in word (in *Our Way Forward*, November 1982, pp

5-6) and in deed (through our work in education, health care and social development).

Self-reliance

We support Government in its efforts to motivate people towards self-reliance.

The war is over. We, the people of Zimbabwe, are no longer at the mercy of the wilful decisions of a minority. We ourselves are responsible for the affairs of our country. This is not only true in the sense that we now have a government elected by the majority. This is true also for every grassroots community and all its members, who must learn to be responsible for their own affairs.

As far as possible a local community must rely on its own resources. Whatever a community can do for itself, it must not expect central government to do for it. Only when the local resources are really exhausted, can help be sought from some higher authority. At this point generous and quick assistance from the authorities will not paralyse, but further stimulate the self-reliant efforts of the people.

Hand in hand with this attitude goes the readiness for self-criticism : we cannot any longer blame only others for our set-backs, but must also blame ourselves.

Self-reliance develops the human person towards its full potential. Traditionally, Catholic Social Doctrine emphasizes the same point by speaking about the principle of subsidiarity.

Sharing national wealth

We also agree with Government that the wealth of our country must benefit all, not just a small minority. We said in 1978 that "without denying the right to private property we must remember that wealth is, first of all, intended to satisfy the common welfare".

We explained further in 1982 that "it is unacceptable to permit an unbridled laissez-faire approach, whereby the economy is swayed by market forces, and all control and ownership of the means of production are in the hands of a small select class of rich people" (*Our Way Forward*, p .10).

Lack of Social Concern

We regret, therefore, the social behaviour of many persons in influential positions at all levels, which flatly contradicts the social justice to which they pay lip-service—a fact which creates a credibility gap especially between the authorities and the ordinary people.

Are all our politicians and public servants, who propagate self-reliance, prepared to render the selfless service and to make the sacrifices that they expect from the ordinary man and woman, particularly in the rural areas?

Where are the former students of our own mission schools who are ready to share their knowledge and skills with the less privileged by serving them in the still to be developed areas of our country, e.g. as teachers, doctors and nurses?

How many of them have understood that they received their education not as “private property”, but as something to be shared with their poorer brothers and sisters?

Change of heart

It is at this point that we must appeal to you, our brothers and sisters in Christ, and to your Christian consciences. Your own personal contribution and sacrifice is needed. Do not say “That’s up to government”. The *State* can provide *external* changes, changes in the structure of society. But these will not bring about the radical transformation we hope for, unless they are accompanied by *internal* change, the conversion of hearts, your hearts! Here lies a great challenge for us as Christians.

In this we know ourselves to be in agreement with Pope John John Paul II who wrote that the right to property is “never . . . absolute and untouchable”. It “is subordinated to the right to common use, to the fact that goods are meant for everyone” (Encyclical Letter, *Laborem Exercens*, no. 14).

Whoever believes in God confesses that whatever he is and whatever he has — all has been given him by God. It is not his exclusive “private property”. It is merely a loan which he must return to the Creator, its true owner. And he returns it by *sharing* it with his fellow man as generously and freely as God out of his love shared it with him in the first place.

Even though "the Church is not committed to any one political party, but co-operates with every political party and social movement which fosters genuine justice" (*Our Way Forward*, pp 14-15), we agree with our Government's declared aims of promoting self-reliance and making the nation share its wealth equitably.

Our true values

Human liberation is basically a question of moral and spiritual values: if a person sees the meaning of his life in his material well-being, accumulating wealth becomes an end in itself. "Eat and drink for tomorrow we will be dead".

If, on the other hand, a person sees the meaning of his life in spiritual values, i.e. the love of God and the love of his neighbour, then material possessions become mere means towards an end.

Faith in God, far from being the "opium of the people", frees man from enslavement to his material possessions and enables him to use the riches of this world towards truly human ends, i.e. living a life of love in communion with God and his fellow men.

The radical transformation that is necessary to free man in the very depth of his heart from selfishness and greed is a gift from God. No-one can give himself this "new heart" (Ez. 11, 18-19).

Where we differ

We therefore find ourselves unable to go along with those of our fellow citizens who have adopted, together with socialism, an atheistic philosophy as their creed. This is incompatible with both our Christian belief and the best in our African tradition. Through some tragic misunderstanding they hold that God has to be eliminated in order to liberate Man. This liberation does not involve the inner man, but is brought about merely by external forces, i.e. by continued class struggle.

We do not deny the existence of conflict between different classes and between rich and poor nations. But we cannot accept that strife and conflict by themselves are positive forces of transformation. A society torn by hatred does not

suddenly give birth to love and harmony. If this is "Scientific Socialism", we cannot accept it.

It is not by fighting to the bitter end, but by analyzing the causes of the conflict and by resolving it, that we can create conditions in which the self-reliant efforts of our people will bear fruit.

Serving in Freedom

Where mere words fail to persuade, the authorities may eventually be tempted to apply force. But you can only build a society with the free co-operation of all its members. Man finds fulfilment in committing his whole person in freedom to the service of his fellow men. But this is very different from forcing a person into a situation, even for a limited time, which allows little or no regard for his or her human dignity as a son or daughter of God.

We wish, therefore, to support those of our leaders who have assured the public repeatedly that only persuasion, not force, will be applied in integrating people into the new social order. At the same time, we wish to encourage voluntary co-operative ventures.

A "new creation"

For us as Christians, only with God's help can we transform a society inclined to greed, selfishness and hatred into a "new creation" (2 Cor. 5, 17) capable of love, compassion and generosity.

It is God's work through us. Atheistic Marxism, on the other hand, attempts to prove that Man can accomplish God's work on earth all by himself.

We, as followers of Christ, put all our trust in the Kingdom of God. Far from awaiting its arrival in passivity, we strive with all our might towards its realization here and now well knowing, however, that God alone, who has first announced its coming through Christ, will bring about its completion.

This is the way in which the Church pursues her aim of radical transformation of man and society. This spiritual mission is her specific contribution to the development of the country.

We, your Bishops, invite you to participate in this mission with even greater zeal in this new year of 1984.

Book Review

TRACT FOR THE TIMES

Fundamentals of Catholicism by Kenneth Baker, S.J.; Ignatius Press, Distribution Center, 15 Oakland Avenue, Harrison, New York 10528, U.S.A.; published in three volumes as follows: Vol. 1, pp. 282 \$9.95: Vol. II, pp. 381, \$11.95: Vol. III, pp. 388, \$11.95. All three volumes now available.

Father Kenneth Baker, S.J. is in no way a pretentious man, even though you might say he has plenty to be pretentious about. He is, in the first place, a Catholic philosopher of no mean ability, who has to his credit a two-volume History of Philosophy, which is the fruit of hard and persevering intellectual effort over a good span of years. But Father Baker is no man confining his movements within a tight intellectual circle, the result of which so often is the mental isolation of the person concerned and his diminished ability, in consequence, to pronounce intelligently on matters of wide-ranging import. This, coupled so often with his thought of himself as increasingly capable of doing just that, emerges so often as that unlovely and increasingly irritating phenomenon of our times, known as "*La trahison des clercs*"— the betrayal of the truth by the intellectuals; from which the contemporary world has suffered perhaps more than its predecessors.

There is no atom of this about Father Baker. I say this on the basis of my personal knowledge of himself and my friendship for him, which is of long standing. Also, as one privileged to read the *American Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, which he has edited for many years with a very sure touch; above all, with total devotion to the Church. He has never sent his Review trailing along in the wake of the progressive tide within the Church, seeking, thereby, to gain a bogus popularity. On the contrary, Father Baker has always stood with great firmness and faith by the Church's true teaching. From this he has never wavered. And he has shown his firmness and faith

not only in his own editorials which always give clear evidence of both. He has a great gift for clear exposition, which he combines with true and genuine simplicity of style to convey to the reader a point of Catholic teaching or to give his own gloss on the same in a few hundred words.

It is precisely these gifts which he has brought to the writing of his recently published three-volume work, *Fundamentals of Catholicism*. It is, in consequence, in no way difficult to read; at the same time, profound because dealing with the depths of the Catholic Faith. In consequence, of the utmost value at the present time because giving to the Catholic layman and priest of today, hard-pressed as both so often are by the confusion within the Church, a clear view of the Faith that is theirs — as a whole and in particular. The whole of Father Baker's exposition of the Catholic Faith is laid out in orderly fashion so that the whole of the Church's teaching is covered and can be read, for example, by Parts into which the separate sections of each of the three volumes is divided; or by sub-sections, each dealing with a point of dogmatic or moral teaching, into which the Parts themselves are logically and methodically split up. For example, Part IV of Volume 2, which deals with Christology, contains 23 sub-sections dealing with a whole range of points of Catholic teaching concerning Christ Our Lord. Topics covered are as varied and fascinating and all-important as Christ's Divinity, His perfect manhood, his knowledge and His freedom from sin. Not all of that and much else besides can be swallowed at one gulp. It can be acquired with patience and prayer and intelligent reading and study. The light skimming of a part can be well and effectively done; then followed by the study each evening of the 2 to 4 pages, which is the maximum space occupied by a separate section.

I have to say with real sincerity that I cannot recommend these three volumes too highly. They seem to me to be God's gift at this time for those parents who are struggling so bravely to bring up their children in the Faith. These volumes, I suggest, are what they have been looking for. Try them and see.

Paul Crane, SJ